

Review

Author(s): L. W. King

Review by: L. W. King

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Jan., 1915), pp. 50-51

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853871>

Accessed: 02-01-2016 04:53 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Egypt Exploration Society* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

detracts in a minor degree from its value, is that he sometimes fails to apply this test, and is consequently rather prone to hazardous conjecture. Under such a heading we should be inclined to include the derivation of *Erebos* from Assy. *erēbu*, "to enter" (p. 88) or *Delilah* from Heb. *laylāh*, "night," and Sumerian *lil*, a night-demon. *Irkalla* is correctly derived from the Sumer. *Urugal* (p. 249), but it certainly had not the meaning "the great eater," and, as neither had any solar connotation, there are no real grounds for connecting the name *Herakles* with them. It is quite true that the god Bes was a foreign importation into the Egyptian pantheon; but it is hardly probable that he was a solar deity and there is little to justify equating his feather-crown with Samson's locks and solar rays. The same anxiety to make his point (which is also characteristic of the German astral school) seems to have led the author into such false Hebrew etymology as the suggested derivation from the same root of Hebr. *shachar*, "dawn," and *sē'ār*, "hair" (p. 38), or *chāmôr*, "he-ass," from a root *chāmāh*, "to be hot" (pp. 123 f., 128). But a great part of the book is taken up with general rather than linguistic parallelisms; and viewed as a popular study in comparative mythology, its author's aim at interesting his readers in the Hebrew records, when treated in a spirit of critical investigation, will no doubt be fully achieved.

L. W. KING.

*Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*: 1913-14. pp. viii+102. Manchester: At the University Press, 1914.

We welcome the punctual appearance of the second volume of this journal, the record and product of the combined Egyptian and Oriental Societies of Manchester, each of which, before their amalgamation, carried on its work in isolation and consequently appealed to a more restricted circle. From the present volume it is clear that the new Society continues to cast its net wide, and to cater successfully for the varied interests of its members. The special papers open with an appreciative notice by Prof. Peake of the work of the late Prof. Driver, in which we are glad to see emphasis is laid on the debt the younger generation of Hebrew scholars owe to his help and to the labour he was always ready to lavish on their work. The original contributions also include two papers on Zoroastrianism: one, a review of Prof. Moulton's "Hibbert Lectures" by Bishop Casartelli; the other a collection of survivals of religious material, drawn from Zoroastrian and kindred sources, which may be detected in the *Acta Sanctorum*, particularly in the Syriac and Armenian recensions. The latter paper, by Dr Louis H. Gray, is of considerable interest. Mr A. C. Dickie writes on the Jews as builders, Canon Johns on some Babylonian tablets in the Manchester Museum, Dr W. H. Bennett on Pentateuchal Criticism, and the editor of the Journal, Professor Canney, contributes notes on Hebrew philology. The Oriental side of the society's work is in no danger of being swamped by the interests of its new partner.

Among the Egyptological papers, with which we are here more concerned, is one by Mr Milne on a Greek ostrakon of the first or second century A.D., found by Prof. Garstang in the "fish cemetery" at Esneh and now in the Manchester Museum. The writer was evidently an almost illiterate person and Mr Milne is to be congratulated on the ingenuity with which he has made out its contents. The text contains a complaint by the owner of a private shrine that he had been locked out by the wife and daughter of his overseer, in spite of his kind treatment of them. The name of the god to whom it was dedicated is not mentioned. But Mr Milne points out that such privately owned shrines were not uncommon in Egyptian villages of the Graeco-Roman period, though the income derived from the offerings of worshippers does not seem to have made them very valuable properties: he works out the annual value of a one-sixth share of such a shrine at only fifty days' wages of a labourer. We may compare the rather higher values which privately owned temple-revenues appear to have enjoyed in Babylonia a few centuries earlier. We possess a number of assignments of such rights to the offerings of the faithful, dated in the second and third centuries B.C.; and it would appear that the right to take the offerings, even for an hour or two during one day of each month, was eagerly sought after. In India, too, at the present day, temple-offerings are sometimes controlled by private families, who in rotation divide the proceeds among themselves and make a considerable profit out of them.

In a note on the persistence of ancient Egyptian burial customs in Nigeria Prof. Elliot Smith calls attention to an article contributed to the "Journal of the African Society" by Mr P. Amaury Talbot, a District Commissioner in the Nigerian Political Service. Mr Talbot, who had occasion to visit two South Nigerian tribes living near the Gulf of Guinea, found that their burial rites present resemblances to those of ancient Egypt. The practice of embalming their dead would, in itself, not suggest survival; but a more striking parallel is presented by their grave-construction. They dig a pit, and from the bottom of this an underground passage, sometimes thirty feet long, leads to a square chamber where the body is laid; stones and earth are afterwards piled over the pit's mouth. One of the tribes, the Ibibios, also build near their town arbour-like erections as houses for the dead man's double, with figures of his favourite wives and slaves—the counterparts, Mr Talbot suggests, of the *ushabtiu*. Even if we should be inclined to suspend judgment on the theory of direct Egyptian descent, the parallelisms are well worth noting. For in any case they illustrate the working of the African mind, and support the views of those who emphasize the African elements in ancient Egyptian culture.

From this short notice it will be seen that the volume fully maintains the interest of its predecessor, and shows that Egyptological study continues to be well represented at Manchester. Of the eight lectures given during the year five fall under this category, including one by Prof. Petrie on scarabs, and others by Dr Alan Gardiner on Hieroglyphic writing, and by Mr Peet on Sinai. Miss Crompton's description of the Egyptian collection in the Manchester Museum, which follows the annual report, tempts one to hope that she may later on publish a *catalogue raisonné* of the objects, to the arrangement and labelling of which she has devoted so much time and care.

L. W. KING.

*L'Égypte monumentale et pittoresque*. By CAMILLE LAGIER. pp. 240, 48 plates. Brussels and Paris: Vromant et Cie. 1914.

Of books descriptive of Egypt and its marvels there is an abundance, yet the number of such volumes worthy to be read twice, or to be given a permanent home on one's bookshelves, is small, but among this number *L'Égypte monumentale et pittoresque* should find a place. Its author is not unknown as an Egyptologist. The articles he has written for the well-known *French Dictionary of the Bible* of Vigouroux show that he is familiar with the literature of Egyptian archaeology, and that he can write luminously about the many obscure problems of ancient Egyptian history.

Those who have already visited Egypt will be glad to revive the memories of their wanderings in that wonderland by reading in this book the impressions made upon the author during his residence and travels there. The fortunate people who have not yet journeyed to Egypt—fortunate, because much of the pleasure of life lies in the intelligent anticipation of its joys—will find in this description of the monuments and beauties of Egypt all the delight of a well-written novel, with this satisfaction added, namely, that it is all true.

With the exception of the scientific Egyptologist—and even he will be able to learn something from seeing old knowledge from a fresh point of view—this book can be used by the traveller in place of the somewhat tedious guide-books generally resorted to, and it can be trusted, while avoiding minute details, to bring before the tourist almost everything of interest or value and worthy of notice. The lore of modern, as well as of ancient, Egypt is drawn upon with graceful facility by this real expert in illustrating his remarks on both monuments and scenery.

Our author's lightness of touch is displayed early in the book by his description of the two beasts of burden, the camel and the ass—indeed, no less than a short history of the latter animal in eastern lands is given with point, while the story of Tell el-Amarna and Khu-n-aten reveals the more serious side of his knowledge. The large number of plates adds to the value of the book.

F. G. WALKER.